

Stakeholder Meeting III

Exercise Results

About the Exercises

At the May 2nd Music Row meeting, stakeholders were divided into five (5) groups and asked to participate in a series of exercises designed to generate specific feedback on fundamental components to develop a Music Row Code.

Specifically, Exercise I proposed a draft framework for a Design Review Committee designed to balance and represent the broad interests and needs of Music Row. Individuals were asked if the proposed membership adequately reflected the needs of a Music Row Code Design Review Committee and which key Music Row interest groups were not represented.

Exercise II started a discussion on the way in which different applications might be reviewed by a Design Review Committee. The draft review procedures were designed to achieve the goal of fostering the culture and success of a Nashville music industry while protecting historical assets. Individuals were asked to weigh and describe advantages and disadvantages of each review process.

Exercise I. Based on input received from stakeholders, the preliminary framework is designed to represent the broad interests and needs of Music Row and establish a balanced Design Review Committee.

Per Planning staff's proposal, the Music Row Design Review Committee would consist of eight (8) members listed below and serve a term of four (4) years:

One member would be appointed by the following:

- Mayor, on behalf of the Music City Music Council – to be a music industry representative
- Vice Mayor, on behalf of the Metro Council*
- Metropolitan Planning Commission*
- Metropolitan Historical Commission*

*the member must be a professional in the fields of architecture, landscape architecture, urban design, planning, or another related discipline

One member would be nominated by each of the following organizations with confirmation by Planning Commission:

- Music Row Neighborhood Association Representative
- Edgehill Neighborhood Association Representative
- Belmont Representative
- Vanderbilt Representative

See questions and responses beginning on next page.

Responses (with corresponding table number):

Question 1: Does this membership adequately reflect the needs of a Music Row Code Design Review Committee?

- Less weight should be given to institutional owners [such as Belmont and Vanderbilt Universities]. They are not here to preserve music culture. (1, 3)
- Do not agree with "on behalf of the Music City Music Council" but preferred "on behalf of a music industry stakeholder" (1)
- Do not agree with including a representative from the Edgehill Neighborhood Association (1)
- Agree with having design professionals, including real estate and developers (2, 3, 4)
- Eight (8) is too few, ten (10) would be better (3)
- Should be nine (9) members so that there are an odd number of people on the committee.
- Owning property should not be mandatory (3, 4)
- A four year term seems too long; maybe two years for appointed members so you don't have all new members rotating at once (3)
- Prefer Hillsboro Village model with more local representatives and it being a recommending body rather than the DTC model. The framework with appointed officials seems too politicized. (5)

Question 2: Which key Music Row interest groups, if any, are not represented on this committee? Please explain the reasons they should be included.

- Include more Music Row stakeholder representation such as property owners and business owners who own property (1, 4)
- Include more music industry representation, such as small-scale businesses, large-scale businesses, diversity (2, 3, 4)
- Include more representatives from Music Row Neighborhood Association (3)
- Include "at-large" representatives so that other industries, such as a law firm, are included (2)
- Include church interest groups (4)
- Include non-profit interest groups (4)

Exercise II. The purpose of this exercise is begin discussion on the way in which different application might be reviewed by the Design Review Committee in order to achieve the goal of fostering the culture and success of a Nashville music industry.

Stakeholders were encouraged to discuss the pros and cons of three scenarios, each demonstrating a development scenario and possible process for that scenario.

Scenario 1 – New Construction meeting all requirements of the Music Row Code

A property owner proposes to build a mixed-use building that includes professional offices, a small restaurant space, and residences above the offices. The proposal meets the minimum requirements of the Music Row Code.

Step 1: Meet with the Planning staff to identify the necessary application process.

Step 2: Submit a development application.

Step 3: Staff reviews the application and determines it to be in compliance with the minimum requirements of the Music Row Code.

Step 4: Obtain all necessary permits. No DRC review is required.

Responses (with corresponding table number):

Pros

- Overall, like process (4, 5)
- Streamlined process (1)
- Speed of process / not delayed / expediency (2, 3, 4)
- Should be written clearly and robust enough to know when it is met (5)

Cons

- Depends on what code requires (1)
- DRC would not see the project. DRC should see all projects for transparency. No check in place. (3, 4)

Other

- Historic properties, including WOC, should require DRC review. All demos need an e-mail notice to DRC with a time frame. (4)

Scenario 2 – New Construction requesting a modification from the requirements of the Music Row Code

A property owner proposes to build a mixed use building that includes professional offices, a small restaurant space, and residences above the offices. The proposal doesn't meet the minimum requirements of the Music Row Code and requires approval of a "modification" to allow for a slight deviation.

Step 1: Meet with the Planning staff to identify design solutions and the necessary application process.

Step 2: Submit an application for Design Review Committee (DRC) consideration.

Step 3: Staff reviews the application and makes a recommendation to the DRC based on the intent of the Music Row Code and surrounding context.

Step 4: The DRC convenes an open meeting and makes a final decision on the application.

Step 5: If approved, obtain all necessary permits. If denied, the applicant may appeal to the Planning Commission.

Responses (with corresponding table number):

Pros

- Overall, like process. (3, 4)
- Gives voice to area, versus BZA (4)
- Still appeal process (3)

Cons

- Planning Commission could overturn DRC decision (1)
- Potential to stall / slow down. Don't want to hold up good development (2, 4)
- Advisory role for DRC is more appropriate (2)
- Look into how an SP process would work w/ Music Row Code. If developers still have the option of SP, it negates the entire process (3)
- As written, there is little public input in the process. The process should include the ability for the public to appeal and the minimum number of people/signatures required to appeal the DRC decision. Also need to establish whether DRC meetings are a public hearing or just an open meeting. (5)

Other

- See value in DRC advisory role (2)
- Concern with possibility of demolition of structures (4)

Scenario 3 – Addition to a property listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NR) or determined to be a National Register eligible (NRE)

The owner of a property listed as NR or NRE because of its cultural significance to Music Row proposes an addition to the building to expand its use.

Step 1: Meet with Planning staff to review the proposal and determine the necessary application process.

Step 2: Submit an application for Design Review Committee (DRC) consideration.

Step 3: Staff reviews the application and makes a recommendation to the DRC based on the intent and criteria of the Music Row Code.

Step 4: The DRC convenes an open meeting and makes a recommendation to the Planning Commission.

Step 5: The Planning Commission makes a final decision on the application.

Step 6: If approved, obtain all necessary permits.

Responses (with corresponding table number):

Pros

- Overall, like process (4)
- Every property is considered. If significant work proposed, gives chance for review by community at public hearing (2, 4)
- Historic on DRC could help w/ analysis and the DRC needs that Historic input (3)
- Like the extra step of going to the Planning Commission. Why not do this for all applications? (5)

Cons

- Planning Commission could overturn DRC decision
- Time required for review is uncertain (2)
- Potential for overreach (issue related...) (2)
- More red tape for property owners who just want to do a renovation (4)

Other

- Balance b/c process / historic criteria (2)
- NR should have priority over NRE. (2)
- Consideration in more detail is necessary before final, as it relates to height. (2)
- Airspace to sell even in the 3 story cap one as... (2)
- Question of NRE properties needs to be decided on before process can be fully decided on. Keeping up with a list of NRE properties is critical. (3)
- Consider a scenario w/ South Music Row Neighborhood Conservation Overlay District as a subdistrict within the Music Row Code and reference the historic district (similar to the Downtown Code). This would create a more cohesive Music Row Code. (3)
- Concern with possibility of demolition of structures (4)